A GODLYE SERMON:

Preached before the Queens most excellent Maiestie, vpon the 17. 18. 19. verses of the 16. Chapter of S. Mathew:

VVherein is contained the conclusion of a Dialogue betweene Christ and his Disciples: Shewing breefely that the authoritie which the Pope of Rome doth challenge to himselfe, is vnlawfully vsurped.

Very necessarie for these perilous times wherein the simple may perceiue their intollerable impietie, vsurping that office and action, which euer appertayned vnto Christ only.

Published at the request of sundry godly and well disposed persons.

¶ *Imprinted at London by* Iohn Windet for Iohn Perin, and are to be sold at his shop in Paules churchyard, at the sign of the *Angel* 1585

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

A godly Sermon preached before the Queenes most excellent Maiestie, vpon the 17.18.19. verses of the 16. Chapter of S. Matthewe.

Matth. Chap. 16. vers. 17.

17 *And Iesus answered, and said to him: Blessed art thou Simon the sonne of Ionas: for flesh and bloud hath not reuealed it vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauē.*

18 *And I say also vnto thee, that thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not ouercome it.*

19 *And I will giue vnto thee the keyes of the kingdome of heauen, and whatsoeuer thou shalt binde vpon earth, shalbe bound in heauen: and whatsoeuer thou shalt loose on earth, shalbe loosed in heauen.*

THese words which I haue read (right honourable, & beloued in our Sauioure Christ) containe the conclusion of a Dialogue, betweene Christ and his disciples. For we read immediatly before in the thirteenth verse of this sixteenth Chapter, that when Iesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi: our Sauiour Christ,

partly to make tryall of the faith, knowledge, and profiting of his disciples: having bene now so long taught by him, and seene so great & wonderfull miracles: and partly to learn whether they conceiued any better of him than the common multitude: as also to cause them to make a confession of their faith and beliefe in him, in which he might strengthen and confirme them against al troubles and persecutions that were after to ensue: he demaunded of them all, this question, whome do men say that I the sonne of man am. Answere was made by them, that some said he was
Math.14.2. Iohn Baptist, for so surmised the Herodians, as apeareth in the 14. of this Gospel. Where it is sayde, that when Herod the Tetrarch, who had beheaded Iohn Baptist, heard of the fame of Iesus, he said vnto his seruaunts, this is Iohn Baptist, that is risen againe from the dead, and therefore great workes are wrought by him. Some said he was Elias, being deceiued partly by the Prophecie of Malachie, misvnderstode, who had prophcied that Eliah
Malach.4.5. the Prophet should be sent before the comming of the great and fearfull day of the

Lord,

Lord, partly, by the like spirite they perceiued in Christ that was in Elias, as the free libertie of rebuking vices in ỳ scribes and Pharisees, the power of working miracles, raising vp the dead to life againe, as Elias did. Some other thought him to be Hieremias because he bare a figure of Christ, and for that it was saide of him, Beholde this day haue I set thee ouer the nations, and ouer the kingdomes, to plucke vp, and to roote out, and to destroye and throw downe, to build and to plant: which was in verie deede, truely to be perfourmed in Christ. And they that thought him none of these, yet because of his doctrine (for he taught them as hauing authoritie, not as the Scribes) and for his life and miracles they accounted him as one of the Prophets. Christ hearing this, to draiwe out a more certaine and excellent confessiõ out of his disciples than this was, he further demaunded of them all, but whome say ye that I am: as though he should haue said, whatsoeuer other men do thinke of mee, or howsoeuer they be distract in opinions, you who ought to haue better knewledge of mee, whome do

Ierem.1.9.

Matth.7.29.

ye thinke me to be. Then aunswered Simon Peter in the name of al the rest: thou art Christ the sonne of the liuing God. Christ reioycing at this true perfect and constant confession that Peter had made, as it were in recompence and commendation therof, he burst out into these words: Blessed art thou Simon the sonne of Ionas, for flesh and bloud hath not reuelled it vnto thee, but my father which is in heauen, &c. Which wordes are euen the conclusion of that Dialogue betwæne Christ and his disciples, and do containe the approbation and commendation of Peters confession. In the which many things do offer them selues to our considerations, but for this present time and occasion, in these thræ verses, thræ especiall pointes may be here obserued by vs. The first from whence Peter had this knowledge & faith of Christ, that he was the sonne of the liuing God. Secondarily, what is the foundation and rocke, whereupon the Church of God was built. Thirdly, what the power, authoritie, & commission was, that is giuen vnto Peter in this place. The first point is declared in the first verse of

this

this text by two meanes, first by remouing and denying those things, which might seeme to be the cause & yet are not, as flesh and bloud. Secondarily, by expressing the true and perfect cause, which was the reuelation of Almightie GOD. For the first, by flesh and bloud is meant here, the nature of man, and all his giftes that he hath naturally, as his wit, vnderstanding, and wil: for so it is taken in sundrie other places of the holie Scriptures, as in ẏ first of Saint Iohns Gospell, where he saith that such as receiued Christ, they were borne not of bloud nor of the will of flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And in the first to the Galathians, where he testifieth, that when it pleased God to reueale his sonne in him, that he shoulde preach him among the Gentiles, he communicated not with flesh and bloud, and in like manner, in the sixth to the Ephesians, exhorting vs to put on all the armour of God, that we might be able to stande against the assaultes of ẏe diuell, because we wrestle not against flesh & bloud, but against principalities, and powers, &c. In which places as in diuerse others also, by

Ioan.1.12.

Galath.1.1

Ephes.6.12.

flesh and bloud is meant nothing but the nature of man, and whatsoeuer is in him by his naturall birth and procreation, so that this phrase and manner of speech vsed of our Sauiour Christ here in this place doth signifie and declare vnto vs, that this knowledge of Christ, & confession of faith, which Peter made, he had it not of himself, neither by any meanes of man, but from aboue, by the manifestation and reuelatiõ of God, who had opened this great mysterie, and giuen him this faith. This doctrin ouerthroweth the iudgement and opinion of the Heathen Philosophers, Pelagian heretikes, and of the church of Rome, who wholly or in parte ascribe the cause of all knowledge of God, of our faith, of the good workes we do, either to the light of nature, force of reason, or free will and industrie of man, contrarie not onely to this testimonie of Christ here in this place, which deprieth man of all knowledge of Christ, but also vnto the whole tenour of the Scripture in other places, where both generally and in particular sorte, is taken away al vnderstanding and perceuerance, in matters appertaing vnto faith, religion,

and

and the true knowledge of God. First, for proofe hereof, that it is generally denyed vnto man of himselfe, or by the reache of his own wit and vnderstanding to attaine to the knowledge of Christ, & those things which appertaine to the kingdome of God, what can be more plaine then that Paul testifieth to the contrarie in the first of the Corinthes, and the second Chapter, that ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος δὲ οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ. The naturall man is not able to perceiue the things of the spirite of God. The naturall man, that is the man that hath no farther knowledge then he hath by the light of nature, whose knowledge, and iudgement is not lightened and cleared by the spirite of God (for so is this terme expounded by Iude in his Epistle, in the 19. verse) that that man perceiueth not these thinges which appertaine vnto the spirit of God, For proofe hereof he adioyneth two reasons, the one is because spirituall thinges are foolishnesse vnto him: the other, that he cannot knowe those things, because they are spiritually discerned, that is they cannot be known but of them that are endewed with the spirite of God. For as

1. Cor. 2.

Iude. 19. v.

1.Cor.2.11. Paul testifieth, as no man knoweth the thinges of man, saue the Spirite of a man which is within him: euen so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirite of God, and therefore in the same Chapter he sheweth, that those thinges which God hath prepared for them that loue him, are such as eye hath not seene, eare hath not heard, neither yet hath entred into the minde of man, so that neither by the outward senses, nor yet by the vnderstanding of man, we are able to conceiue the things of God, but it is the spirite of God which openeth them vnto vs, which searcheth all things, yea the bottome of Gods secretes. In respect of this great ignorance in vs, and want of power and abilitie to perceiue, the mysteries of Gods kingdome and of our saluation, the holie Ghost hath by most notable termes and Epithetes, whereby he describeth the nature of man, declared vnto vs, how vtterly we be voide of all knowledge and iudgement in spirituall matters. What can more effectually, and significantly, sheweforth that vnto vs, then for vs to be termed darkenesse it selfe, which is don

vers.9.

1.Cor.2.10.

not

not in a fewe places of the holy Scriptures, as in the first of Saint Iohns Gospell, where it is sayd, that that life which was the light of man shined in darknesse, but darknesse was not able to comprehend it that was man. Saint Paul thereof drawetheth an exhortation in his Epistle to the Ephesians to perswade thē vnto newnesse of life, that forasmuch as they were sometime in darknesse, meaning before their conuersion, and receiuing of the Gospel of Christ, now being light, being illuminated by the spirite of God through the preaching of his worde, therefore they should walke as the children of light. And in the second to the Corinthians, setting foorth the power and efficacie of the word he setteth downe, that as God in the creation of the worlde, commaunded the light to shine out of darknesse, so hath he shined in the heartes of his ministers, to giue the light of the knowledge of the glorie of god in the face of Iesus Christ. Where the comparison is to be noted, which the Apostle maketh, that as God in the beginning of the worlde, created light out of darknesse, so hath he done in the hearts of his mini-

Iohn.1.5.

Ephes.5 8.

2.Cor.4.6.

ministers, that by the preaching of the Gospell, that light might shine to others to lighten them, that they might see the glorie of God in Christ. Wherefore euen as before God sayde: Let there be light, there was no light, but meere darknesse, euen so before God worke in vs by his word and spirite, there is nothing in vs, but meere ignorance and darkenesse, no light to behold the glorie of God in Christ. No marueile therefore if Saint Paul being
Act.26.18. called to preach the Gospell do tel Agrippa the King, that God hath called him to open their eyes, that they may turne from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan vnto God, or if Saint Peter com-
2.Pet.1.19. pare the doctrine of the Prophets as vnto a light that shineth in a darke place, and compare the preaching of the Gospel vnto the dawning of the day, and the day starre arising in our heartes. Hereby may it appeare, what wee ought to iudge of our selues to be nothing but ignorance & darknesse, to be voide of all light & knowledge of Christ, vntill by the working of his spirite he openeth him selfe vnto vs. Before which time as Paul testifieth, wee walke

as

as the Gentiles in ȳ vanitie of our minde, *Ephes.4.17.*
hauing our vnderstanding darkened, being straungers from the life of God, thorough the ignorance in vs, because of the hardnesse of our heartes. Thus vseth the Spirite of God, to paynt out the estate of man, before God beginneth to worke our regeneratiõ to ascribe ignorance & blindnesse vnto our mindes, dulnesse and hardnesse vnto our heartes, yea, and that a stonie hardnesse, as appeareth by Ezechiel, where he promiseth that in mercie *Ezech.11.19*
hee will take away our stonie heartes. And vnder the person of the Iewes Esaye *Esa.48.4.*
sayeth, that wee are all obstinate, that our neckes are as Iron sinewes and our browes as browes of brasse, that is not flexible vnto the yoke of Gods commandements, and past all shame to commit wickednesse. Therefore the holy Ghost, describing the corruption of our nature doth terme vs not onely sicke, weakened or infected with sinne, but euen to be dead in sinne. For so Paul to the Ephesians, wher hee setteth out the grace of Christ, affir- *Ephes.2.1.*
meth that hee hath quickened vs that were dead in trespasses and sinnes.

And

And in like manner, in the seconde to the
Colossians: that vs which were dead in
Coloss 13 sinnes, and in the vncircumcision of our
flesh, hath he quickensd togither with him
forgiuing our trespasses. These manner
of termes and epithetes, whereby it hath
pleased God in his holy worde, to expresse
both the vtter want of knowledge, in mat-
ters of faith, and the corruption of our
mindes and manners is diligently to be
obserued by vs, by reason of the doctrine
of the Romish cleargie, who although
they teache, that Adam through his fall,
lost part of that excellent knowledge of
pure and heauenly thinges wherewith he
was endewed at his first creation, & was
greatly wounded both in minde and will
thorough his disobedience, and that nowe
he is not able to perceiue & do those things
which God commaundeth him to vnder-
stand & practise without the helpe of God:
yet do they not ascribe that whole igno-
rance and blindnesse vnto the minde of
man, neither yet that deadly wounde of
sinne, whereby all power and abilitie to
attaine either to the knowledge of God, or
practise of righteousnes, is taken from vs,

which

which by these titles of right they ought. Our light with them in heauenly matters is in some part darkened, but not cleane put out, our vnderstanding diminished, but not extinguished, the image of God, it was appaired, but not vtterly defaced, the free will of man to good, it was wounded & weakened, but not quite taken away. But further we say, that our knowldge is become plaine ignorance, our light, darknesse, our righteousnesse sinfulnesse, our libertie and freedome, seruitude and bondage, the image of God, the image of Satan, that we are not onely deprived of all goodnesse, but further defiled with all naughtinesse, that our former power and abilitie was not onely shaken and weakened through the fall of our first parentes, but that we are vtterly become vnable & impotent, to knowe or do any good thing, and of all abilitie and readinesse to commit all sinne and wickednesse. Most iust then and true is that accusation wherwith Paul chargeth all mankinde in generali, that there is none righteous no not one, that there is none that vnderstãdeth none that seeketh God, that all are gone out of the Rom. 3. 10.

way.

way, that we are become altogether abhominable, that there is none that doth good, no not one, our mouth to be as an open sepulchre, our tongues to be vsed to deceit, the poyson of aspes to be vnder our lippes, our mouth to be full of cursing and bitternesse, our feete to be swift to shed blood, nothing but calamitie and destruction to bee in our wayes, that we know not the waye of peace, no feare of God to be before oure eyes. Thus it is apparant what the Apostle S. Paul thought both of Iew and Gentile, and in them of all men considered in himselfe, to be corrupt abhominable without vnderstanding, and thereof he concludeth he could not be iustifyed by the lawe, but by faith in Iesus Christ. So that euident it is, sauing to him that will not know how the spirit of God hath in general most plainely and plētifully depriued the whole progenie of mā of all knowledge of God, of all goodnesse, yea of all abilitie to attaine thereunto, yet for our further assurance herein, & that this thing may be yet more manifest and cleare vnto vs, the holy ghost hath not only in this generall sort, as I say in the beginning taught this doctrine, but

hath

hath euen in particular so denyed that vnto vs, as it cannot but compel euery man to confesse the truth therof. For to the obtaining or doing of any thing ther be three things requisite, the minde to thinke and conceiue it, the will to atchiue it, and the execution thereof. And if any of these points be wanting, what can be perfourmed or done by vs, but neither to doe, nor to will, neither yet to thinke, lyeth in our power, how farre are we therefore from having power or abilitie, either to come to the knowledge of Christ, or to do any good thing. The first, Christ himselfe witnesseth in the first of Iohn, *Sine me nihil potestis facere*, without mee ye are able to doe nothing. Saint Augustine weigheth & presseth these wordes notably: *Non enim (inquit) sine me difficulter potestis &c.* Christ saith Austine: saith, not without mee ye can hardly do any thing, neither said he without me ye cannot absolue, or finish any thing, or doe any matter of great weight, but he saith simply without mee ye can do nothing. The power therefore to do any thing is flatly denyed man in this place by the iudgement of that auncient

Ioan.15.5.

August. in Ioan.

cient and learned father. In like manner to will any thing, lyeth not in vs, but it commeth by the operation and working of Gods spirit. So testifieth the Apostle Paul in the second to the Philippians, it is God which worketh in vs both the will and the deede, and that euen of his good pleasure, that is of his meere mercie and good will toward vs. If by the giftes and power of nature we were able to do this, the Apostle would not ascribe it to the particular operation of God, especially in them that be iustified. But yet further what seemeth more free and at our libertie then thought, yea, cuē that also is denyed vs, for to think any good thing, lyeth not in vs. So sayeth the Apostle Paul in the seconde to the Corinths: We are not sufficiēt of our selues, to thinke any thing as of our selues, but all our sufficiencie is of God. Wherefore, if both in generall sort, the scripture thus determineth the naturall man to be nothing but darknesse, that in him there is no vnderstanding, that his heart is as hard as a stone, that of himselfe he is dead in sinne and vnrighteousnes, that he is not able to perceiue those things, which appertaine

Philip, 2. 13.

2. *Cor.* 3. 5.

shine to the spirite of God, that they cannot once enter into his heart or minde: but also in particular sort doth denye him the power to do, to will, or to think any thing, we may well conclude against the Philosophers, Pelagians, and Papistes with our Sauiour Christ, that flesh & bloud hath not reuelled either to Peter, or to any other of the children of God, neither yet can do, either in whole or in parte, that Christ is the liuing God, which confession containeth the summe of Christian religion. What then is the true and perfect cause of this knowledge, whensoeuer we attaine thereunto, that is expressed also vnto vs by Christ in ẏ Euangelist, to be God, who openeth & reuealeth this vnto vs: for as he denyeth it to flesh and blonde, so doeth he ascribe the cause thereof to his Father which is in Heauen. For confirmation whereof although many, I may saye infinite testimonyes may bee brought out of the holye Scriptures, yet for that the declaration of the former poynte, hath beene the proofe of this in so cleare a matter, it shal be sufficient to auouche one or two manifest places, for the

further establishing thereof. Among other, that which is sayde by Ezechiel, must needes most manifestly, and clearely declare and proue this point. For the Prophet shewing what great mercies and benefites he would bestowe vpon his people, he promiseth a newe heart will I giue you, a newe spirit wil I put within you, & I will take the stonie heart out of your bodie, and will giue you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirite within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keepe my iudgements and doe them. In which wordes Ezechiel attributeth the whole worke of our regeneration vnto the gift of God, he it is that taketh away that olde & stonie heart, whereby we are giuen to all iniquitie, and hardnesse from giuing eare vnto any cõmaundement of God, & he giueth a newe heart, an heart of flesh, whereby we become apt to receiue the commaundements of God, & a new spirite, which leadeth vs, both to the knowledge of the will of God, and to the obedience thereof. Likewise Moses in Deuteronomie, setting forth the great goodnesse of God to his people Israel, he ascribeth

Ezech. 36. 26

Deut. 36. 6.

cribeth the circumcision of the heart to the operation and working of the Lorde. For God promiseth, that if they returne vnto him, and obey his voice, the Lord God shal circuncise their heartes, and the heart of their seede after them, that they may loue the Lorde their God with all their heart, with all their soule. And to conclude this matter which needeth no further proofe, that which ỳ Euangelist Saint Iohn writeth in the first of his Gospell, howe iumpeth it with this that our Euãgelist affirmeth here, and how euidently doth it confirme both those pointes wee haue hereto stode vpon, where he alleuereth that such as receiued Christ & beleeued in his name, were borne not of bloud, nor of the wil of flesh, nor of the will of man but of God. By which words both the knowledge of Christ, and the beleeuing in his name is denyed to man, & giuen to God alone. The verie worde ἀνωθεν vsed here of our Euangelist, being well weyed doth sufficiently argue, that all heauenly things are hid from vs, vntil they be opened and manifested by God. For this word being attributed vnto God, doth signifie a reuea-

Ioan. 1. 12.

ling by him of such things as were quite
before hidden frõ our knowledge & vnder-
standing. Now if this general doctrin shall
Deut. 29. 30. be proued by particular example, what can
be required for the further certaintie and
truth hereof. Moses in the 29. of Deut. ob-
braideth ỳ people of Israel for their obliuiõ
& forgetfulnes of the graces & mercies god
had shewed them in the land of Ægypt, yet
therwithal he there noteth, that they could
not take any profit by these things but tho-
rough the working & goodnes of God. Ye
haue seen, sayth Moses, al that the Lord did
before your eyes in the land of Ægypt, vnto
Pharao & vnto al his seruãts, & vnto al his
land. The great temptations which thine
eyes haue seen those great miracles & won-
ders, yet the Lorde hath not giuen you an
heart to perceiue, & eyes to see, and eares to
heare vnto this day. And in ỳ 13. of Math.
Christ hauing taught many things by pa-
rables, his disciples came to him and de-
maunded why he spake thus in parables,
Mat. 13. 30. he made answere, because it is giuẽ to you,
to know the secrets of the kingdom of hea-
uen, but to them it is not giuen, therefore
speak I vnto thẽ in parables because they

seeing

seeing do not see, & hearing they heare not, neither vnderstand &c. Thus we see how ẏ people of Israel although they saw ẏ great wonders & miracles, which God did for them in Ægypt, notwithstãding they reap no cõmoditie therby, because the Lorde did not open their eyes to behold them to profit, neither yet their eares to attende vnto such things, or their hart & mind to cõceiue the godnes of God, & obedience & thankfulnes, which they ought to perfourme vnto God therfore. The disciples of Christ, they vnderstood the doctrine of Christ, they profited & encreased in knowledge therby, but why or by what meanes? because to them it was giuen to knowe the secretes of the kingdom of God. The Iewes they were not able to perceiue the doctrine of Christ, they learned nothing therby, but rather became more blind & obstinate, the reason is added, because to them it is not giuen. So that it wholy dependeth vpon the gift of God. Cleophas and the other disciple in the 24. Chapter of Luke, when Christ ouertooke them going to Emaus, although Christe rebuked them for their slowenesse in beleeuing all that the Prophetes

Luc. 24. 27. 45.

had spoken. And accompanying them began at Moses and the Prophets, and interpreted vnto them in all the Scriptures the thinges which were written of him, yet were their eyes so holden that they knewe him not, whome before they had often scene, neither yet vnderstood they the Scriptures vntill such time as God opened their eyes and vnderstanding both to knowe him and vnderstande the Scripture. Euen as the disciples of our Sauiour Christ had no knowledge, no vnderstanding vntill God gaue it them: so fareth it with all the rest of the children of God, heare they neuer so much his Apostles preache, yea, Christ himselfe personally sounding in their eares: yet except the Lorde open our heartes and mindes, as he did Lydia the sicke womans in the
Act.16.14. Actes, it auayleth not one iot, wherefore flesh and bloud reuealeth not Christ vnto vs, but our Father which is in heauen.

It remayneth nowe wee weigh and consider, what commoditie and profite wee ought to reape by this doctrine, & to what vse it ought to serue vs. First, if God be the authour and fountaine and sole giuer

of

of all knowledge, faith and all other heauenly gifts, it must kindle in vs, an earnest and feruent desire to prayer, to desire him to giue vs knowledge and fayth, and vnderstanding, for that other wayes we cannot attaine therevnto. The consideration of this heretofore, hath moued the saintes of God, to be feruente in prayer vnto almighty God for the obtaining of these graces. Among others, how often and how vehemently doth the Prophet Dauid praye for this at Gods hands, as in the 119 Psal. Open thou mine eies O Lord, that I may see the wondrous things of thy law, make me to vnderstand the way of thy commandements, so shall I talke of thy wondrous workes. And againe: Teach me O Lorde the way of thy statutes, and I shall keepe it vnto the end, giue me vnderstanding, and I shall keepe thy law, make me to goe into the path of thy commaundements, encline my hart to thy testimonies, &c. and in the 51. Psalme, that God would make him a cleane heart, and renew a right spirit with in him, that he would throughly wash him and clense him from his sinne. And the Apostle S. Paul prayeth not onlye for him-

Psal. 119, 18. 27, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Psalm. 51.

Ephe. 1. 16, 17. 18.

selfe, but for the Churche of the Ephesians, that the GOD of our Lorde Jesus Christe, the father of glory might yeld vnto them the spirite of wisedome and vnderstanding, through the knowledge of him that the eyes of their vnderstanding maye bee lightened, that they maye knowe the hope of his calling, and what the riches of his glorious inheritaunce is in the Saintes. These thinges as the opening of the eyes, the vnderstanding of the waye of Gods commaundementes, the making vs to goe in the path of them, the creating of a cleane hearte, the renewing of a righte spirite, the clensing of sinne, the inclination of oure heartes to his testimonies, they woulde not haue craued so constantlye at Gods hande, by earnest and humble prayer if they had not bene perswaded they caune onelye from him, to be his meere giftes. Secondlye, as the meditation of this oughte to make vs to praye to obtayne, so hauing atteyned by his goodnesse to anye of these benefites, it shoulde ercite vs also to thankefulnesse after the examples of all Gods Children, and

of

of our Sauioure Christe, who giueth thankes to his father Lorde of heauen and earth, because he had hid his gospell from the wise and men of vnderstanding, and had opened it to babes. Thirdelye hauing receyued anye lighte of knowledge and graces of GOD, wée must haue a greate care in vsing them to encrease his giftes in vs, to prouoke God through our thankefulnesse to bestowe his mercyes in moste humble manner vppon vs. For whosoeuer hath, to him shall bee giuen, but whosoeuer hath not, from him shall bee taken awaye, euen that whiche hée hath, it cannot, neyther oughte it to ingender sloothfulnesse in vs, because GOD giueth and worketh all in all: for moste true and excellent is that warning whiche Saynte Augustine giueth in his Booke *De correptione & gratia. Non se itaque fallant qui dicunt, vt quid nobis predicatur, &c.* That is: Let not (sayth Augustine) them deceiue themselues, who saye, Wherefore is it preached and taughte vs, to eschew euill, and to doe good, if wee doe it not, but it be GOD which worketh in vs, both the

Mat.11.30

Mat.13.12.

Aug. de Correptio: & gratia.cap.2.

will and the deede, but rather let the faithfull know that they are led with the spirit of God, that they may doe, that they ought to doe, and when they haue done it, they may giue thanks to him that caused them, for they are driuen to the ende they should endeuour to worke, not that they should doe nothing themselues.

Fourthly, and last of all this putteth vs in minde of our owne want and imperfection of our blindnesse and ignorauncе, wherby we are driuen to acknowledge our owne miserye, to humble our selues before the Lorde, to praise God in his giftes, we see in our brother, and not to contemn and despise them whome we see to want, nor to be proude and loftie for any thing in vs, but to geue the whole praise and glorye to God alone. Thus noteth Augustine verye well in his booke *De bono perseuerantiæ. Cap. 63 & 6, Nos volumus, sed Deus operatur in nobis velle, nos operamur, sed Deus operatur in nobis, &c.* that is: We will, but God worketh in vs to will, we doe, but God worketh in vs the deed after his good pleasure, this is profitable for vs to beleeue and to say, that is godly and true, that our confes-

August. de bono perseuerantiæ. cap. 63 & 6

sion may be humble and lowly, & the whole may be giuen to God, and in his sixte chapter of the same booke he sayth, *Tutiores viuimus si totum Deo damus, non autem nos illi ex parte, & nobis ex parte committimus*, wee liue or deale the safelier if we giue the whole to God, and not partlye to him, and partly to our selues. The Apostle S. Paule hereof beateth downe the pride and vainglorye of the Corinthian Doctors in that whatsoeuer they had they had receiued it of God. For so he reasoneth, What hast thou that thou hast not receiued, if thou hast receiued, why reioycest thou as though thou hadst not receiued it? If the knowledge of this doctrine, work these effects in vs, then shall we haue learned this lesson, that Christ here teacheth vs, to good purpose otherwise it shall auaile vs no more then to see the meate whereof we may not feede, shall nourish our bodies, or to beholde the gold which we may not vse, shal serue our turne. To conclude, on this part one onelye caueat is to be giuen, that we take heede, that we abuse not this doctrine and maner of speeche, as the Euthusiasts, Anabaptists, and the family of Loue, to the contemning 1. Cor. 4. 7.

or neglecting of the preaching of the word of God, who for as muche as here and in diuerse places besides, it is sayde that God reuealeth the misteries of his kingdom vnto vs, and worketh all things by his holye spirit, therof haue they condemned the vocall preaching of the word, and haue fled to priuat inspirations, & reuelatiõs, dreames, and fantasies, whereby they haue ben lead into diuers dangerous heresies. But wee must this learn & understãd, that although god reueleth his wil vnto vs, and worketh both knowledge & fayth by his holy spirit, yet doth hee it not, but by that meanes hee hath appointed, that is by the ministerie of his word, and therefore Esai the Prophet ioineth in the promise of God made, both the word and the spirite together. My spirite that is vpon thée, and my words which I haue put in thy mouth, shall not departe out of thy mouth, of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of ỳ seed of thy seede (sayth the Lord) from henceforth for euer. Where we see he ioyneth both ỳ word & the spirit together, they are not to be sundered. The Apostle Paul plainly teacheth to the *Romains*, that no man can beleeue in him of whome hee hath

Esai. 59. 21.

Rom. 10. 14. 17.

hath not heard, and that they cannot heare without a preacher, that faith commeth by hearing, and hearing by the worde of God. And in the 4 to the *Ephesians*, he testifieth, that when Christ ascended vp into heauen, he led captiuitie captiue, & gaue gifts vnto men, that he therefore gaue some to be Apostles, some prophets, and some Euangelists, & some pastors, and teachers, to what end: he expresseth it to ý gathering togither of the saints, for ý work of the ministery, & for ý building vp of the body of Christ. If beleefe & faith in him cannot come but by hearing the word of god preached, & his ministers in his church be appointed by him, that the saints might haue all thinges necessarie to the edifying of the bodye of Christ, what impietie is in these Anabaptisticall spirites eyther to condemn or neglect this so excellent not only an instrument, but euen the sole ordinarye meanes God hath appointed to his church, to work our saluation. Paul in the 5 to the *Thessalonians*, giueth warning that we quench not the spirit, but therewithal he ioyneth ý we despise not prophecying, he himself though he was rapte vp vnto the thirde Heauen,

Ephe 4.10.

Thes.5.19.

where

where he heard e wordes which cannot bee
2.Cor.12.2. spoken, which are not possible for man to
vtter, yet did he not therefore broche anye
new reuelations or dreames, but confir-
med his doctrine by the testimonie of the
law and the Prophets. He exhorteth his
1.Tim.4.13. scholer Timothie to giue attendance vnto
reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, to lear-
ning, and to continue therein to saue him-
selfe and them that should heare him. God
reuealed vnto Peter and the rest of the A-
postles, that he was the sonne of the liuing
God, but by preaching so vnto Cleophas
Luc.24.45. and the other Disciple going to Emaus, ex-
pounding the Law and the Prophets, he
opened the doctrine of his passion. God ope-
ned the heart of Lidia, conuerted her vnto
Christianitie, but by Paules ministerie.
Act.16.14. Wherefore although God reuealeth all
thinges, yet is not the spirite to be seuered
from the word, neither yet the word from
the spirite, God doth vse both these instru-
ments ioyntly. And thus much for the first
part.

The second point I sayd we had to con-
sider was, what the foundation and rocke
is, wherevpon the Church of God is builte
for

for that is expressed in the 18 verse. Thou art Peter, and vpon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hel shal not ouercome it. Concerning the true meaning and sence of these wordes, what it is that Christ appointeth to be that rock, whereupon he will build his Church, there is no small variance betwen vs and the church of Rome. We according to the tenor of the rest of the scriptures, and circumstance of the place affirme, that Christ by this word *Petra* a Rocke, meaneth that whiche Peter confessed, whiche was Christe himselfe. But the Popishe Cleargie to establishe the authoritie of the Bishop of Rome, and his superioritie, power and dominion ouer all other churches, hath applied this saying of our Sauioure Christ vnto Peter alone, making him that Rocke, whereof Christ here speaketh, against which the gates of Hell cannot preuaile, affyrming that Christ in this place hath giuen by these wordes a certayne chiefetie and prehemi-nence to Peter aboue all other Apostles, and made him the foundation and heade of his church here in earth and his vicar generall for the gouernmente thereof, en-

duing him with especiall power and authoritie aboue all others. Whiche exposition as also Article of Religion, to bee most vntrue being the mayne poste of their religion, and suche an Article of fayth, the whiche who beleueth not, (as they saye) cannot bee saued, and this place being vsed of them all, especiallye aboue all others, as the cheefest for the confirmation of the Supremacye, and authoritie of the Bishop of Rome: it shall not bee amisse, being apparante sithens this Progresse, that howsoeuer this Doctrine hath bene heretofore beaten downe, that notwithstanding it remayneth rooted in many mens mindes, it shall be expedient to shew and declare this their interpretation to be erroneous, and their collection vaine and friuolous. Which I will doe first by the very words and circumstaunce of the place. Secondly by that, this their exposition is contrarye to the expresse wordes of the Scripture, and rules of Fayth. Thirdely, by the opinion and practise of the Apostles. And last of all by the iudgement, and interpretation of the antient and learned Fathers,

and

and practise of their age. Firste, that euen the verye wordes of the Texte do argue, that when Christ sayth vppon this Rocke I will builde my Church, by this worde *Petra* a Rocke, hée meaneth not the person of Peter the Apostle, but that which Peter confessed, which was Christe it maye appeare by this in that it pleased the holye Ghoste, the Euangelist thoulde alter and chaunge the name πετρος into πετρα when as hee mighte haue vsed the selfe same worde to expresse that their meaning to make Peter the Rock wherevpon he would build his church, for although the word πετρος and πετρα doe agrée in significatiõ, in that both of them by interpretatiõ doth signifi a stone or rock: yet the alteration & chãge of ỷ word in propriety of speech & termination in gender, & in construction of persõ doth import that the holy ghost by these diuerse words would mean a diuers thing. For the one word πετρος is *nomen atticum*, after the proprietie of the Attike tongue, the other πετρα is *nomen communis linguæ*, after ỷ propriety of ỷ vulgar tõgue, the one word is the masculine gender, the other the feminine, the persõ in cõstruction

differeth, for from the second person he goeth to the third, he saith not ὅτι τούτῳ πετρῷ, vpō thée Peter, but ὅτι τούτῃ τῇ πετρᾳ vpon this rock By this varietie and change it is plain the Euangelist ment to expresse some diuerse thing, otherwise it néeded not to haue made any alteration at all, there is no doubte therefore but the holye ghost vpon purpose, did alter and chaunge the worde πέτρος into πέτρα. euen to auoyde that erroure that mighte bée gathered thereof, if Christe woulde haue taughte vs in this place so weightye an Article of oure Fayth, as that is, (as they make it,) that Peter muste bée the Heade of the Churche, vppon whome excepte wée bée builte we cannot bée saued, hée woulde not in declaration thereof, so haue varied from his ordinarie name hée gaue him, séeing it mighte so well haue serued the turne, and by whiche hée mighte playnely haue declared this grounde of Fayth. Wherefore by the worde πέτρα is meante not the Person of Peter, but Christe, whome Peter confessed and beléeued on. For whiche cause Peter immediatelye before in the former verse,

was

was pronounced blessed by our sauioure Christe, for that GOD had opened and reuealed vnto him, that Christe was the sonne of the liuing GOD, and further for the knowledge and beleefe hereof, hée did not onely terme him blessed, but hée also gaue him another name, that whereas before hée was called Simon Bar Iona, hée shoulde nowe bée named כיפא, that is a Rocke, according as hée had promised in the firste of Iohn, because hée knewe and beléeued in the Rocke, vpon whiche not onlye hée, but the whole Churche of GOD shoulde bée builte. For hée was so named of Christ, not because hée shoulde bée *Petra* the rock, wherevppon the Congregation of God shoulde bée builded, but hée was called כיפא because hee was builte vpon that Rocke whereon the Churche should be founded. *Petra* whiche is the Rocke (as Augustine sayth) hath not his name of Peter, but Peter of *Petra* the Rocke, as Christ hath not his name of a Christian, but a Christian of Christe, and Sainte Ierome affirmeth that Peter had his name of *Petra*, whiche is Christ, whiche name

August. serm. 21. de verbo domini.

Ierom in 8. Math.

agreeth not onely to the person of Peter, but vnto all Christians and faythfull people, which beleeue in this Rocke, and hold the same fayth and confession Peter did. Whosoeuer confesseth and beleeueth that Christ is the sonne of the liuing God, as he did, is a Peter. Therfore Ierome vpon the sixt of Amos, termeth al Christs Apostles Peters: And Origen plainly testifieth, that if we affirme and confesse that Christ is the sonne of the liuing God as Peter did, then are we Peters, and shall obtaine the same felicitie that he hath obtayned because our confession and beleefe is al one, and againe in the same place, if wee confesse Christ to be the sonne of the liuing god, the father reuealing it vnto vs, it shal bee sayd of eche one of vs, thou art Peter, and vpon thee will I build my congregation, euery man is *Petra* a Rock, that is, a follower of Christ. Thus muche Origen, By whome it is playne that Peter was so named because of the Rock he beleeued in, not for that hee was to be the foundation of the church: and that also, that name to be tearmed a rocke is not agreeable to Peter alone, but vnto all the faithfull, and

Ierom in 6. Amos.

Origen. tract. 1. in Math.

and no maruaile, for it is an vsuall thing for the properties of Christe to be attributed to all his children, as christe is called a stone, so are his people and seruauntes named lyuelye stones by participation, as they are the lighte of the worlde, and salte of the earth, because the salt and lighte that they haue is deriued and procedeth from him. And as wee are called righteous, because christe is our righteousnesse and wisedome, so are wee tearmed Rockes because by him we are so made, being the true, perfecte and sounde Rocke. Wherefore if Peter be pronounced blessed, onely because of the confession hee made, and that his name was chaunged from Simon vnto Peter, for that cause alone, and that his name agreeth to all christians, who holde and make the same confession hee did, as well as vnto him, then is it apparante by the order and Sequel of the Terte, and truth of the matter, that the Rocke whereon christe will builde his churche, is not the person of Peter, no more then it is the person of anye other Apostle, but that whereby both Peter, and other

faythfull, shall be come both blessed and Peters. For if wee marke the order and course of the Dialogue betweene Christ, and his Disciples first wee may obserue, that the Question is propounded not to Peter alone, but generallye vnto all, whome doe ye saye that I am. And agayne, Christ demaunded not what they thought of Peter, but what they thoughte of him, so that in ỳ respect we cannot imagine any especiall thing ment, and intended toward Peter more thẽ any other. For in that he made aunswere alone, that was in the person of them all, to auoide confusion and declare vnitie, as Ciprian sayth, he was but their mouth, So also Austin saith *Petrus sæpe vnus respondit pro omnibus, &c.* Peter oftentimes made aunswere for all, the Lord asking and saying whome say ye that I am, Peter answered, Thou art the sonne of the liuing god, he only gaue answere for many, to declare vnity in many. And what was the cõfessiõ of Peter, it was that Christ was the son of the liuing God, this cõfessiõ was approued & commended of Christ, not the person of Peter, but in respect of the confession, herewithall if wee marke

Cyprianus de simpli. prælat.
August. serm. 21. de verbo domini.

marke what happened immediatly after the conclusion of the dialogue vnto Peter, nothing can be more plaine than that Peter cannot be that rocke whereupon God will build his Church, for that rocke must be such against which the gates of hell can not preuaile, how can Peter then be that foundation, who immediatly after this confession fell so grieuously, that he was termed of our Sauiour Christ, Satan. For Peter diswading him from going vp to Ierusalem, to accomplish the worke of our redemption, he saide vnto him, away from mée Satan, thou sauourest not the things that are of God, but the things that are of men. And afterwarde he denyed & abiured his Master, he was farre therefore from being that vnmouable rocke, which could not be shaken, such an one against which the gates of hell could not preuaile, so then to conclude this pointe, if the change and alteration of the word and construction may argue the meaning of a diuerse thing, when otherwise the selfe same worde might haue better and plainlyer declared that so weightie and necessarie an article of our faith, as they make

that is of Peters supremacie, if the blessednesse of Peter and the name be obtained of Christ, and that the same be not only proper to Peter, but vnto all who shal in like manner lay holde vpon that rocke and professe the same faith, if the whole course of the dialogue be directed not to know Peters opinion alone, but of them all, what they thought, not of Peter, but of our Sauiour Christ, and to confirme them in that firme and stedfast faith, they had in him against all troubles and persecutions, that should after ensue, and with all to haue a publike testimonie of them all, that they had a better and truer opinion of him, then the common multitude, if the rocke wherson Gods Church must be founded, must be such an one as cannot be shaken by any force and subtiltie of Satan, and Peter as hath appeared, was so weakened at diuerse times, that he was ouercome almost for euer. I may well saye, that euen the wordes, and circumstance of the place, doth euict that Peter is not made that *petra* the rocke vpon the which the Church is to be built. But yet that this may be further out of doubt, if we well weigh the assertion

sertion of our Romish Catholikes, we shal finde it to be contrarie to the expresse wordes of the Scripture, and the doctrine of the holie Ghost in other places, yea, and to the analogie and rules of faith. Saint Paul in the 1. to the Corinthians, finding fault with the Corinthians, who were deuided by choosing to themselues sundrie doctors and teachers, whome they would heare and followe. Some saying I am Paules, another, I am Apollos, another, I am Cephas, & the fourth, I am Christes, he flatly setteth downe, that *fundamentum aliud nemo ponere potest, preter id quod positum est, Iesum Christum.* Other foundation can no man lay then that which is laid, which is Iesus Christ. If onely Christ be the foundation and no other: If neither Paul, nor Apollo, nor Cephas, ought to be so accompted, how can they challenge this prerogatiue vnto Peter, being denyed so expressely vnto him or vnto any other. Paul affirmeth, that GOD had made all things subiect vnder Christes feete, and appointed him aboue all things the head of the Churche, which is his bodie, and of what kinde of bodie

1.Cor.

1.Cor.3.11.

Eph.1.22.

bodie that he declareth also in the fifth of the same Epistle, of his flesh & his bones, for saith he, Christ nourisheth and cherisheth his Church, because we are members of his bodie, flesh and bones, wherefore if the Church be the bodie of Christ, and God hath appointed Christ to be the head thereof, and that head be of the same nature and substance, of the same flesh and bone, the rest of the bodie is: what cause is there to make any other head, except we should thinke either that one head not to be sufficient to giue life, and to rule the bodie, or to be to mightie and of to great rule and authoritie, and therefore do adioyne another thereunto, as when two Consuls or Cæsares be created of one place, the one to abridge ye others power and might. But neither of these inconueniences can be feared in Christ, and therfore we néede not to assigne another head to his bodie. Besides the head of ye Church is that part of the bodie which giueth life, nourisheth and augmenteth the whole bodie of the faithfull vnto eternall life, but who doth or can performe this but onely Christ? euen as a man cherisheth his own

Ephe. 5. 30.

flesh,

flesh, so nourisheth he the Church which consisteth of his own flesh and bone as the Apostle Paul testifieth, he therefore is the onely head. There is the same reason betweene Christ and his church, that is betweene man and wife, as the same Apostle testifieth, for as the husbande is the wiues head, so Christ is the head of the church, as the church is in subiection to Christ: so the wiues to their husbands. As Christ loued his church, so wiues their husbands. As wiues are their husbandes flesh: so is the church the flesh of Christ. So that then, he that is the head of the church is the husband and spouse thereof. For, therefore he is the head because he is the husband, but there is but one husband therefore whosoeuer shall make any other head of the church then Christ, must also make another husbande, if another husband, then an adulterer and the church an harlot, for one wife cannot haue two bridegromes or husbandes, Paul sayth of the Corinthians, I haue prepared you for one husband, to present you a pure virgin to Christ, & Iohn Baptist in the Euangelist Iohn sayeth, he is the bridegrome & his A-

postles be the only ministers & frinds of ye bridegrome, they are only the makers of the mariage betwen Christ & his church. How can Peter then be accounted as the head of Gods church, Christ himselfe being the head and the husband thereof? Let him therefore be esteemed as a minister, & frinde of the spouse, as Christ himselfe hath termed him and all the rest of the Apostles, and no further. And surely it is not lightly to be regarded, that after Christ had said to Peter, thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke will I build my church, whereby they would establish a chiefetie & preheminence giuen him ouer all other the Apostles and congregation of God, arising this controuersie among them, which of them should be the greatest, and that euen then, when he was readie to go to suffer, & depart from them, supposing (as it shoulde seeme) after the departure of Christ, some one of them should be chief, and beare rule ouer the rest: euen then our Sauiour Christ beateth downe vtterly, that conceite and imagination of theirs, shewing that rule and soueraintie belongeth vnto Kings and Princes. The Kings of the

Gentiles

Gentiles they reigne, they beare rule, they are called gratious Lordes. But ye shal not be so, it shal not be so among you, whosoeuer wilbe the chiefe among you, let him be your seruaunt, and he setteth himselfe an example before them, that he came not to haue seruice done vnto him, but to serue, and to giue his life for the redemption of many. Hereby although it were the especiall purpose of our Sauiour Christ to take away that ambition which reigned in his disciples by reason they dreamed to obtaine by him an earthly and terrestriall kingdome, notwithstanding being so often occasioned to declare thorough their desire of soueraintie and rule, and especially before his death & passion, whome after his death he would leaue his deputie and vicegerent of whome they should depende and be gouerned, it may giue iust occasion to thinke, that as when he was conuersant with them in flesh, he would not giue any supremacie or prehe-minence to any one more than to another, but made them all equall, so also after his ascension he would haue them so continue, especially the reason of Christ being such

as is appliable to the whole course of this life. This strife and contention would not haue risen, if they had knowne at any time Christ had appointed Peter their chiefe gouernour, or else might easily haue beene ended, if aunswere had beene made by Christ, that Peter was he who shoulde be in his stead after his death. But what if this doctrine of theirs be contrary to the groundes of our faith, shall we think then their interpretation to be true, if Peter be the rocke wheron the church is to be built, then must the church also beleeue in Peter, for the church cannot be built but by faith and beliefe, but to beleeue in Peter is to ascribe that to the creature, which onely is to be yelded vnto the creatour, and therefore it cannot want great impietie to giue this vnto Peter which they doe. Besides the church of God containeth the whole companie of the faithful, euen from the beginning of the worlde vnto the ende, why then if Peter be the rocke of the whole and vniuersall church of Christ, then must the faithfull that were before Peter was born be founded vpon Peter and depend on him as their head, but to affirme that, I think

cannot

cannot want absurditie, therefore except you will make euen the visible church of God to haue had many visible heads, this their assertion must prooue but a vaine imagination. If we further call to minde that which Paul writeth of Peter, that hee was the Apostle of the Iewes onely, and Paul himselfe the Apostle of the Gentiles, can Peter be accounted the foundation and head of the vniuersall church, when as to preach vnto the Gentiles belonged not to him? this reason driueth Cardinall Poole into such streightes, that whereas other of his adherents saye, Peter was appointed head of the church here, other immediatly after his resurrection, he is compelled to saye, that Peters supremacie tooke no place before Paules conuersion, for that before that Peter could not represent the person of Christ, and leaue twelue Apostles to figure vnto vs the twelue tribes of Israell. Wherefore these things being well weyghed together, first, that the Apostle flatly setteth downe that no man can, or ought to laye any other foundation then Christ himselfe, the Corinthians seeking especially to depende vppon some one pricipally, as their cheife teacher, I

denying it to bee lawfull for them to depende vppon Cephas himselfe, who was Peter. Secondly, assigning Christ the head, the husband of his bodie the church, his spouse, his wife, in which thinges there can be no communion or fellowship. Further, this controuersie arising so often among his disciples, who shoulde be the chiefest, and our Sauiour Christ denying all superiorite at all times to any of them, neither yet giuing any signification that Peter shoulde be their chiefe, no not after his death, and this their interpretation being such as causeth to giue that vnto man which is proper to GOD alone, as faith and beliefe, and to make diuerse bodies, diuerse churches, diuerse heades, diuerse foundations, when the holye Ghoste appointeth but one Church, one head, one foundation, and last of all the Holye Ghoste assigning vnto Peter, the ministerie of circumcision onely, wee may iustly affirme the exposition of our Romish Cleargie, to be contrarye to the expresse worde of GOD and rules of our faith.

I am not ignorant here of their blinde subtilties and distinctions, whereby they

would

would shift of the force of these reasons, in making Christ *natiuum & reale fundamentum*: The naturall and substantiall foundation, but Peter *ministeriale fundamentum*, the ministeriall foundation here in earth: that is, that the ministerie and office of Peter is appoynted of GOD aboue the function of all the other Apostles, to be that ministerie wherby he will build his vniuersall Churche, and gouerne it: vppon whome, and of whome all other Churches must hang and depende. Which assertion to be most vntrue, that any principall authoritie, either for the buylding vp of the Church, or gouernement thereof, was by this place or any other committed vnto Peter aboue the other Apostles, it may appeare by this that none of the Apostles, either in their writings or doinges, hath euer acknowledged any such thing, but the contrarie, accounting him but equall to others, giuing him no pracheminence aboue his fellowes. For proofe hereof, what can be more manifest, than that Paul writeth to the Ephesians, where the Apostle of purpose speaking of the building of the Church, and their Apostolicall

Ephes.2.19.

function, sayeth, that nowe they were no more straungers and forrenners, but citizens with the Saintes, and of the houshold of GOD, and that they were buylt vppon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Iesus Christ himselfe being the head corner stone. By this worde foundation in this place, he meaneth vndoubtedly the doctrine of the Apostles, and wee see further, that hee speaketh in generall of the Apostles in the plurall number, not attributing any thing to any one of the Apostles, as to a principall, who shoulde be preferred in this buylding before others: and besides, he hath layde Christ, the head corner stone, vppon which the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets must worke vpon. The same Apostle in the fourth Chapter of the same Epistle, describinge what gyftes and functions GOD hath left to his Church, for the building thereof hee sayeth Christ after his ascention gaue some to be Apostles, some Prophets, some Euangelistes, some Pastours and teachers, to the gathering together of the Saintes, and buylding of the bodye of Christ: but to haue appointed or giuen

Ephe. 4. 11. 12.

any generall and vniuersall Bishop, or Pastour, to that ende, there is not one worde, neither there, nor in the first to the Corinthians, where the Apostle declareth the diuersitie of giftes and functions, GOD hath giuen to his Church. Saint Iohn in the one and twentieth of the Reuelation, describing heauenly Hierusalem the Church of GOD buylt by the similitude of a Citie, he maketh that the Wall of the citie had twelue foundations, and in them the names of the lambes twelue Apostles. Here wee see in this built citie of GOD, nothing is giuen to Peter aboue the rest, all are made equall, the doctrine of all the Apostles is alike, tearmed by the name of foundations, and haue all share alike in the Walles of the Citie of GOD What cause is then why any prerogatiue should bee giuen to Peter more then to any other. They shall eate and drinke at Gods table in his kingdome, and sit and iudge the twelue Tribes of Israell alike, as appeareth by Luke, which coulde not bee, if principall power were giuen to Peter which they striue for, ouer the whole Church.

1.Cor.12.28

Apoc.21.14

Luk.22.30.

And yet, that this may appeare more manifest. Let vs marke that Paul writeth in the 15. to the Romanes, where he
Rom. 15. 20. sayth, that hee enforceth himself to preach the Gospell, where Christ had not beene preached, and why? least, sayth hee, I shoulde haue built vppon an other mans
1. Cor. 3. 10. foundation. And in the first to the Corinthians, he testifieth, that according to the grace of GOD giuen vnto him, as a faithfull builder, he had layde the foundation of the Church of Corinth. If Paul in diuerse places did so preache the Gospell, that he might not build vppon an other mans foundation, if the Corinthians the buylding of GOD, were founded by Paules ministerie, then Peters ministerie is not necessarily the foundation of all Churches, or else Paul challenged to himselfe more then he ought. But if none of these testimonies were extant, the Epistle to the Galathians were sufficient to conuince their assertion. For it appeareth there, that diuerse false Prophets, and vaine glorious teachers, went about to deface Paules doctrine, and bring him out of credite and his disciples, saying that Paul was not so excellent an Apostle as

Peter and Iames were, and the other Apostles, that were conuersant with Christ while he liued here vppon earth, that hee was since called to bee an Apostle, therefore the other were rather to be followed and beleeued than hee, and so forth. Paul vnderstanding and perceiuing this, he goeth about to prooue, that hee is no whit inferiour to Peter, Iames, or anye other the Apostles, for that the Gospell hee taught, hee receiued it not of man, neither was hee taught it, but by the reuelation of Iesus Christ. After his calling, hee went not of manye yeares to Ierusalem, to learne any thing of the chiefe Apostles, when hee came vp to Ierusalem, it was to see Peter onely, and to declare his consent and agreement in preaching of the Gospell, because of sclaunders, not to learne anye thinge of them that seemed to bee the chiefest Apostles.

Gal. 1. & 2. Chap.

Peter, Iames, and Iohn, seeing the Gospell of vncircumcision was committed to him, as the Gospell of circumcision was vnto Peter, in that God, which was mightie in the one, was mighty also in ẏ other, they required no submission or obedi-

ence at Saint Paules handes, or to doe any homage to any of them, but they gaue vnto him, the right hande of fellowship. And further, hee was so farre from acknowledging Peter his superiour or better. That when he came to Antioche he withstoode him and rebuked him to his face, for his dissimulation, betweene the Iewes and Gentiles. If this be well considered, wee may well perceiue that Paul accounted not of Peter, as of his head, or chiefe of the Church, naming Iames and Iohn pillers of the Church as well as hee, and not yelding to him any thing aboue him selfe.

2.Cor.11.5. In the seconde to the Corinthians, Paul declareth that he thinketh himselfe nothing inferiour vnto the chiefest Apostles. Peter, in his Epistles, he neuer challengeth any superioritie, neither by title nor by doctrine, he maketh Christ the elect precious and chiefe corner stone, and all the faithfull liuing stones of the spirituall house a like, hee claymeth not ciuill gouernement, or that Kinges and Princes ought to bee subiect vnto him as the Pope doeth, but commaundeth all Subiectes to bee obedient vnto their

Princes and gouernours, he termeth him selfe but *compresbyterum*, a fellowe elder with the rest, and exhorteth his fellow ministers not to be as Lordes ouer Gods heritage, in his whole writing he doth not imperiously commaund, but humbly exhorteth, not to be ouerlong in this, it cannot be thought, that Paul and Peter, and the rest of the Apostles hauing so fully and plentifully taught all thinges, appertaining to the Church of God, yea euen the least functions, that they would in all their writings haue concealed so great, weightie and necessarie point, as this of Peters supremacie and one general head vnder Christ, for the gouernment of his Church, being suche as it is made of thē, that whosoeuer acknowledgeth it not, cannot be saued. Now if this which I haue taughte by the opinion and iudgement of the Apostles, shall appeare also by their practise and dealing towarde Peter, what can be required further for the ouerthrow of their interpretation. And for a perfect view hereof, let vs but consider the whole order and manner of the firste *Actor.15.5.* councell holden of the Apostles in the 15. of the actes: there it is mentioned, that certaine variance and dissention falling onte

by reason some of the sect of the Phariseis, vrged the obseruation of circumcision, and other ceremonies of the law, as necessarye to saluation, it was determined that Paule and Barnabas should go vp to the Apostles & Elders at *Ierusalem*, about this question. At their cõming the matter being declared the Apostles & Elders assẽbled together to reason of the matter, after much debating, Peter arose and declared what God had reuealed vnto him, cõcerning this point, meaning at Cornelius conuersion. After him arose Paul & Barnabas, who also tolde their opinion, & what God had opened vnto thẽ. Thirdly ariseth Iames, hee approueth the former iudgemẽt, confirmeth it by ỳ scriptures, and hauing done so, giueth aduise to send their determination in writing concerning the questiõ, it was taken & approued, & the Apostles and elders, & the whole congregatiõ sent chosen men, namely Barnabas & paul, with their letters. First here is to be obserued, ỳ it is not mentioned that Peter sũmoned this Councel by his authoritie, but it is done by the consent of the Apostles and elders, contrary to that prerogatiue the Pope chalẽgeth to himself. Peter although he spake first alone, yet followeth

it not that he was therefore accounted the chiefest, for neither spake he only and often times in great Councels, the lowest and yongest begin first, the eldest & head of all speaketh last. Secondly, in the assemblye after Peter had opened his mind, and al the rest had don, last of al, not Peter, but Iames pronounced the sentence, whiche belonged to the head and President of the Councell. Thirdly, the Legats & embassadors which were sent, were not appointed by Peter, nor sent by his authoritie, after the maner of the Pope, but they were chosen by all the Apostles and Elders, & the whole congregation, and sent by them. Fourthly the stile of the letter doth argue, they gaue no preheminence to Peter aboue other in this assemblie, for thus it runneth: The Apostles, Elders and Brethren send greeting, &c. For as much as we haue heard, &c. It seemed good to vs, when we were come together, to send chosen men to you, &c. it seemed good to the holy ghost & vnto vs, to lay no more burthen, &c. Thus we see how the whole action is made common to them all equallye, none named, or preferred before another, in anye respecte, farre diuerse from the Popes determination,

Act.8.24. and stile of his letters, the tenour of which runneth much otherwise. Besides in the eight of the Acts, when the Apostles heard that *Samaria* had receiued the Gospell, the Apostles sent Peter and Iohn to confirme them, whiche sending declareth plainelye, that they did not acknowledge him as a superiour, and in that he obeieth and followeth, he declareth himselfe to bee but their fellow. For be it that Eckius sayth true, that oftentimes the chœfest of the company be sent in matters, yet there is no Senate nor councell that will send their chœfe and
Act.11.3. gouernour. And the same Apostle in the 11 Acts, being reproued for going to Cornelius, he excuseth and cleareth himself, giuing a reason of that his doing. And of Paul in
Gal.2.11. the second to the *Galathians*, he was reproued to his face, for that he was worthye of rebuke, wherefore to conclude, if neither in planting of the church of God, neither in deciding of controuersies in matters of religion, neither in enioyning & commaunding thinges to be done, neither yet by any title, dutie, seruice or signification of dealing, Peter either bare himselfe, or the rest receiued him as their head and vniuersall Bishop, but contrariwise both he vsed him

selfe, and they made themselues equall in all their doings vnto him: I maye iustlye conclude that euen the opinion and practise of the Apostles and primitiue churche, doth manifestly conuict the interpretation of the Papists in this place, making Peter ye rock, foundation, and heade of Gods Churche to bee most vntrue. This point notwithstanding by this I haue already said, it be sufficiently proued, yet for diuers mens further contentation, let vs see howe the auntiente and learned Fathers, haue expounded this place, whether by this worde *Petra* they haue vnderstode the person of Peter, or him whome Peter confessed, whiche was Christ. Chrysostom in the 55 Homily vpon Mathew, expoundeth *Petra* to be ye faith and confession. *Super hanc Petram. i. in hac fide & confessione ædificabo ecclesiam*, that is, vppon this Fayth and Confession I will build my Church, and vpon the 32 Psalm, *Statuit pedes nostros super petram id est super fidem, &c* that is he hath set our feete vpon the rocke, that is vpon Faith, for Fayth in Christ may well be called a Rocke which cannot be broken, wherefore when Peter had declared and sayd, thou art the sonne of the liuing God, Christ immediatelye

Chrys. hom. 55. in Mat.

Chrys. super Psal. 32.

added, thou art peter, and vpon this rock I wil build my church. Thus it is apparãt Chrysostom toke not the person of Peter to be that rock here mentioned, but ý which Peter reposed his beléefe in. Augustine in this place writeth thus. *Super hanc Petram quã confessus es, &c.* that is, vpon this rock which thou hast confessed, vpõ this Rock which thou hast acknowledged, saying thou art the son of the liuing God, I will build my congregation, vpon my selfe I will build my church, vpon my self I will build the, not my self vpon thee, for they that would haue mẽ build vpon mẽ said, I hold of *Paul*, another I hold of *Apollo*, another I of *Cephas* which is *Peter*, but other which would not be built vpon *Peter* but vpõ the rock, said I hold of Christ. Againe in another place *Super hanc Petram quam confessus est ædificabo ecclesiam, &c* ý is, vpon this rock which thou hast confessed I wil build my church, for the rocke was Christ, vpõ which foũdatiõ *Peter* himselfe was built, for other foundation then that which is laid, cã no mã lay, which is *Christ Iesus*, the church therfore that is founded on *Christ*, hath takẽ the keyes of the kingdome of heauẽ of him. I omit that which

Aug. 21. de verbis Dom.

Idem in Ioan. tract. 124.

he writeth also in his booke against ỳ *Iewes Pagans*, and *Adrians* where he also expoundeth this place after this maner. By this it appeareth how he expoũded this rock here mẽtioned, not to bee Peter but Christ himself. *Gregor. missenus* saith, *Tu es Petrus, &c.* Thou art Peter, & vpon this Rock I will build my Church, he meaneth, saith he, the confession of Christ, for he had sayd before, thou art the sonne of the liuing God. And Hilarius, *Petra nihil aliud est quã firma et inconcussa discipuli fides.* The rock is nothing else but the strong and assured faith of the Disciple. What can be plainer then that which Origen writeth vpon this place. If wee confesse (sayth he) Christe to bee the sonne of God, the Father reuealing it vnto vs, it shall be sayd to ech one of vs, thou art Peter, and vppon this Rocke will I build my Congregation, euery mã is *Petra* that is a disciple of Christ, vpõ such a rock all ecclesiastical learning is builte, if thou thinke that the whole church is only builte vpon Peter, what wilt thou saye of Iohn the sonne of thunder, and of the other Apostles. And further indeede it was spoken to Peter, vpon this Rocke I will build e my Congregation: Notwithstanding,

Idem contra Iud. Pag. & Arri.

Greg. Misse. in testimonijs delectis ex veteri testamento.

Hilar. lib. 4. de Trini.

Orig. tract. in Math.

it is ſpoken in like maner of all the other Apoſtles, and to all faithfull and perfite becauſe they are all Peters, and Rockes, and vpon al them and the Prophets, is Chriſts Church built, and the gates of hell ſhal not preuayle agaynſt any of them. Wherefore if they will giue credit to Origen who was within 235 yeres after Chriſt, that, that which was ſayd to Peter, ſhall be ſayde to euery Faithfull man, making the like confeſſion, and that this which was ſpoken to Peter here, was ſpoken to all the Apoſtles, and to all Faithfull and perfite men in like maner. Then is here nothing attributed more vnto Peter, then vnto any of the other Apoſtles. Gregorie was himſelfe Biſhop of Rome, and whome our Romiſh Clergie woulde haue to chalenge this dignitie and prerogatiue, they giue vnto Peter, hée of this place and diuerſe others which they vſe, as moſte weightie to confirme Peters and the Popes Supremacie, inferreth the quite contrary. For he reaſoneth thus, to Peter it was ſayde, Loueſt thou me, fede my ſhéepe, Satan hath deſired to ſifte thée, but I prayed that thy Faith may not faile, thou being conuerted, ſtrengthen thy Brethren, thou art Peter, and vpon this Rocke

Greg. lib. 4. 33. Epiſt.

will I build my church, to thee I will giue the keyes of the kingdome of heaue, whatsoeuer, &c. and he concludeth in the end, notwithstanding Peter is not called Vniuersall Bishop. This one man hath left sufficient witnesse behind him to condemn in Peter, and in all Bishops of Rome, both the name of that dignitie and superioritie, and also the authoritie and iurisdiction which the Pope doth claime vnto himselfe by vertu of this place. For first how sharply and bitterly writeth he against this, that either Iohn the Bishop of *Constantinople*, or any other Bishop shoulde claime or tearm himself to be the vniuersall Bishop of the whole Church in his Epistles: First in his fourth booke he tearmeth this Title and name, a new, a proude, a pompous name. In his 38 Epistle of the same booke, a rash, foolish, peruerse name, a name of errour. In the Epistle following, a wicked name, a name of vanitie, a name of hypocrisie, a name of blasphemie. In his first booke and 2 Epistle, a puffe of arrogancie and in the 24 Epistle of the same Booke a superstitious and vngodly name. So farre then in his iudgement is it from being agreeable to Gods will, for any Bishop to

Greg. lib 4. Epist 32. Ep. 38. Ep. 39.

Lib. 6. epi. 2.

claime this name, that he accounteth it a
most vngodly and impious thing, and not
only the name, of modesty and humility is
thus disalowed of him, as some woulde
beare vs in hande, but the very office, au-
thority & iurisdiction that is claimed there-
by, for other wise ỳ reasons he vseth were
Lib.4.38. of no force, for in the 38 Epistle of his 4.
Booke hée reasoneth thus. What answere
wilt thou make vnto Christ, at the trial of
the last iudgement, that goest about vnder
the name of an Vniuersall Bishop to sub-
due all his members vnto thée. Here he
condemneth the name, for that hee
whiche desireth it, goeth aboute to sub-
due all the members of Christe vnto him.
Whiche in verye deede is broughte to
passe not by the verye name, but by
the power signifyed by the name. His
Comparison in the thirtith Epistle of the
Li.4.30.Epi. sayne Booke, where he resembleth him
to Lucifer, that affecteth the name, can-
not condemne the name onlye, but the
thing also, because it was not Lucifers
desyre onelye to bee named God, but
also to sitte in his seate, and execute his
Dominion. When as in that place hee
sayeth that Iohn Bishop of Constanti-
nople

nople, challenging that Title, doeth *Contra Euangelicam Doctrinam* against the meaning of the Gospell, against Saint Peter the Apostle, agaynste the Ordinaunce of the Canons, agaynst the faith, agaynste all the Churches of GOD, agaynst GOD hunselfe, and many other thinges more in anye mans iudgement that maye bee sufficiente, by his authoritie to disallow the name, and the office, not onely in Iohn the Bishop of Constantinople, but also in any other Bishop that shall clayme it. For that some seeke to auoyde it, in posing ouer this whole writing to bee against Iohn the B. of *Constantinople*, as though Gregorie had misliked this name of vniuersal Bishop in him so ambitiously & greedily seeking for it, & not if it had ben giuen to his own Sea of *Rome*, this is but a meere shift. For thus he sayth in 32 Epistle, *Nullus Romanorum Episcoporum hoc singularitatis nomẽ sibi assumpsit*. None of the Bishops of *Rome* euer receyued this name of singularitie. And againe *Nullus predecessorũ meorũ hoc tam profano vocabulo vti consensit*, None of my Predecessours euer consented to vse this vngodlye name, *Nos hunc oblatum honorem nolumus* Greg. Epi. 32

suscipere, We will not take this honour offered vnto vs, and in very deede no more he would, for in his seueth Booke hee findeth
Lib.7.30. fault with Eulogius the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, for terming him in the preface of his Epistle the vniuersall Pope, and for saying (as you commanded) requiring him to doe so no more, and not to vse any suche tearmes. So that he disaloweth that name and authoritie to be giuen to himselfe as well as to the Bishop of *Constantinople*. This that Gregorie did, to disallow the authoritie of Vniuersall Bishop in anye, was not onely done by him, but also by diuers other learned and godly Bishops, yea and by Councels. First, that is cleare which Cyprian that godlye man and martir of God writeth in his Oration he made in the Councell of *Carthage* concerning this poynt, it remaineth, saith Cyprian, that euerye one speake of this thing what he thinketh. For there is none of vs that maketh himselfe Bishop of Bishops, or that doth by tyrannicall feare driue his Fellowes to obey of necessitie, seing euerye Bishop at his pleasure, hath free libertye and power of his owne will, as if he could not be iudged of another, neyther yet him-

selfe indge any other, let vs all waite for the indgement of our sauiour Christ, who only and alone hath power to make vs gouernours of his Church, and indge of oure doing. Thus Cyprian denieth to anye to chalenge to himselfe to be Bishop of Bishops, that is to bee vniuersall Bishop, to haue power and authoritie ouer the rest, to compell them to obay, and to indge of them he giueth frée libertie to all Bishops alike in that, and giueth that prehemínence to Christ alone, whose of right it is. That which Pelagius also writeth, who was before Gregorie is playne. Let none of the Patriarkes, sayth he, at any time vse this name of vniuersalitie, because if one Patriarke be called vniuersall, the name of Patriarch is thereby taken awaye from the other, But let this be farre from the Faithfull. The wordes of pelagius and Gregorie be so plaine, that Edmundus Rufus writing agaynste Molinæus the Lawyer, cannot tell how to auoyde them, he is driuen to interprete this worde *vniuersalis singularis*, the vniuersall Bishop, that is the singuler and only Bishop. But God wot, this pore shift will not serue the turne, for the greéke worde οἰκουμενικὸς ἐπίσκοπος,

Pela Ep. 99

the Bishop of the whole habitable worlde quite ouerthroweth that, for it cannot bee expounded the onelye Bishop. The disliking of this preheminence and power which the Bishop of *Rome* nowe challengeth to himselfe, was not only gaynsayde by their Bishops priuate opinions, but euen by Councels. For in the Councell of Carthage it was decreede, that the Bishop of the firste Sea bee not called the cheefe of Priestes, or the high Priest or by any other like name, but onelye the Bishop of the first Sea, by whiche name hee was tearmed, not for any principalitie or power, he had aboue the other Patriarkes but because the Romane Empire was the cheefe, therefore the Bishop of that sea was tearmed by that name, and tooke the place in Councels at that tyme, and yet had no further authoritie, then the Patriarche of Constantinople, Alexandria, or Antioche, I omitte the Councell of Hippo Rhegius, and of Africa, by which it appeareth too manifestlye, what was the iudgemente of the Churche at those tymes, concerning the geuing any principall power or prerogatiue to the Bishop of Rome aboue all others. It is

Conc. Carth. Can. 26.

Conc. Hippo cap. 27.
Conc. Africa. cap. 92.

playne by the Historye of tymes, that they neuer heald any suche Article, that it was of the necessitie of saluation, to beleeue the whole Churche of GOD must bee vnder one heade, one generall, of whome they must depende, they would neuer yeelde or consent to any suche decree or constitution. It is well knowne how that Gregory the first Bishop of *Rome* of that name called Iohn the Bishop of Constantinople the forerunner of Anti-Christ, for ambitiously desyring to be supreme heade, and to bee called the vniuersall Bishop of the World that was habitable. Halfe a score yeare after, or little more, Boniface the third of that name, obtayned through the helpe of Phocas the Emperoure, whome hee had helped vnto the Empire, by killing Mauritius the former Emperour, his wife, his brother, and his sonne, with many other, to bee named or ordeined Pope, or *summus Pontifex*, the high Bishop, which authoritie encreased afterward more & more, vntill it came to the highest pride. So that apparant it is, that the Churches of God, for the space of foure hundred yeares, and more after the death of our Sauiour Christ, neuer

Greg. lib. 2 Cap. 154.

taught, or receiued any such doctrine, either out of this place of Mathew, or anye other that Christ hath left after his ascension an head of his vniuersal church here in earth, or appointed an vniuersall Pastor of the whole congregation vnder him. Ecclesiasticall ambition begate this office first, and mans constitutions and Traditions hath only confirmed the same. This I trust, I haue sufficiently declared according as I promised, both by the interpretatiõs of the antient and learned Fathers of this place of Mathew, and by their generall opinion, concerning the appointing of an Vniuersall Bishop ouer Gods Churche, as also by the practise of that age in that behalfe. Wherein I am the more sparing, because it hath bene at large declared of others in this age, that there is no necessitye in this worde *Petra*, in this place to make Peter the Foundation of the Congregation of Christe, and so consequentlye his Successoure, but lette vs graunte thus muche, that Peter was made that Rocke, that hee were the cheefe, and Prince of the Apostles how doth it followe therefore, that the Bishop of Rome is the Foundation and the cheefe of

all Bishops. It wil be saide that the Bishop of Rome is Peters successour, & therefore whatsoeuer prerogatiue was giuen vnto Peter, was also giuen to him. First besides this consequent followeth not, not to driue them to prooue that euer Peter was at Rome, which they are not able by any sound proofe out of the Scripture, being great presumptions to the contrary, neither yet by any agreement of Ecclesiasticall writers, not agreeing of the tyme of his comming or abode there: I wouldе gladly knowe why and wherein the Bishop of Rome is rather accounted Peters successour, then any other Bishop. If it be because Peter was at Rome, so was he also at Ierusalem, and at Antioche as appeareth in the actes of the Apostles, why should not then the Bishops of Ierusalem and Antioche be accounted Peters successours, as well as the Bishop of Rome. If it be because Peter suffred there, so did Paul also, and surely that is but a meane reason to make Rome the Sea of Peters succession, because that citie put him to death. But wherein are the Bishops of Rome his successours, whether in his Apostleship, or in his Bishoprike, not in the

former, for then must they immediatly be called to that office of God. Secondly, their ductie must be to preache to all nations: for both these properties be required to make an Apostle as may appeare Gal. 1. Matth. 28. But neither of these are agreeable to the Bishop of Rome, being neither immediatly called of God, neither executing the office of an Apostle in going about to preache to all nations, he cannot be his successour in his Bishopricke, for neither doeth hee take vppon him the office of a Bishop to be tyed to a certaine charge, and besides, how can he be successour to Peter in that which Peter was not, he was by office an Apostle, not a Bishop. And further, if we will beleeue auncient writers, Peter was neuer Bishop of Rome, for Irenæus and Eusebius say, that Paul and Peter founded the Church of Rome, and that Linus by them was appointed the first Bishop. Then succeded him Anacletus, and thirdly Clemens. And Tertullian nameth Clemens the first Bishop of Rome, appointed by Peter, as Policarpus was ye Bishop of Smirna appointed by Iohn. Thus although Tertullian agreeth not with Irenæus and Eusebius

Gal. 1. Matth. 28.

Irenæus contra Valent.

Tert. lib. 10. de pres. heret.

in appointing the first Bishop, yet it is euident, that neither of them accounted of Peter as of the Bishop of Rome, but as of an Apostle, who taught there as Paul did also. So that the Pope cannot be Peters successour in his Bishopricke, because hee was neuer Bishop of Rome. If hee saye, hee is his successour in his doctrine, if he were able to iustifie that it woulde beare some colour. But if the quite contrarie be prooued, then is that allegation nothinge, and besides that ought to be common to all Bishops, and therefore by that he can challenge no prerogatiue.

I might declare at large howe farre he is from succeeding Peter in many respects, but that were too large a fielde to enter in, but euen as all those be not the children of Abraham, which come of Abraham concerning the flesh, but those that doe the workes of Abraham, euen so those are not to be esteemed the successours of Peter, or any of the Apostles, which followe them in place or in name, but those which followe them in their faith and doctrine, which thing if they can shewe they doe, we will in parte graunt

them to be successours to the Apostles. I will not stande longer vppon this point, I trust that which I haue sayd shalbe sufficient, for the confirmation of the second part part I tooke in hande to prooue. Nowe I will hasten vnto the third.

There remaineth then the third parte to discusse, which was, what the power & commission is that was giuen to Peter in this place, when it is saide to him: To thee wil I giue the keyes of the kingdom of Heauen, whatsoeuer thou shalt binde on earth, shalbe bounde in Heauen, &c. which wordes being spoken vnto Peter & giuing him by expresse wordes the keyes of the kingdome of Heauen, and the authoritie of binding and loosing, thereby they haue inferred some speciall authoritie and prerogatiue to haue bene giuen to Peter aboue all other by our Sauiour Christ in this place. Wherefore concerning the interpretation and sense of these wordes, seeing there is no agreement betweene vs & the church of Rome, in that they saye, that hereby Peter was endewed with speciall commission aboue all other the Apostles, & we contrariwise doe affirme that, that which was spoken vnto him was spoken

to all the rest alike. For the better examination of this, it shalbe necessarie for vs to consider these two pointes: First, vnto whome these wordes were spoken, whether vnto Peter alone, or principally, as the Papistes woulde haue it, or vnto all in generall. Secondly, what is that power and authoritie which was giuen vnto Peter, for in neither of these points do wee agree with them. For the first, that although these wordes were directed to Peter alone, yet that thereby our Sauiour Christ meant not to giue him any speciall priuilege or prerogatiue aboue his fellowes, but to ende w them al with the like authoritie, first, both the wordes and circumstance of the place, and the doctrine of the scriptures in other places doth declare it: and secondly the iudgement and opinion of the auncient & learned fathers, doth approue the same. That the whole course and circumstance of the place doeth euict this promise & gift of our Sauiour Christ, to appertaine to them all, it may be apparant by this. First, that the question of our Sauiour Christ is propounded to thē all. Whome do ye say that I am, and therefore he requireth not the opinion of

Peter alone, but of them all, that their knowledge and opinion of him, may better agree, and be more constant, truer, & perfecter than the opinion of the common people, which before they had declared vnto him. And the aunswere also Peter made, was not in his owne person alone, but for them all. So sayeth Austine as was alleaged of mee before: The Lorde asking and saying (saith he) Whome do ye saye that I the sonne of man am? Peter aunswereth: Thou art the sonne of the liuing God, one gaue aunswere for many. The conclusion of the dialogue appertaineth also vnto all: for in the ende Christ forbad not onely Peter to tell any bodie, that he was Iesus that Christ, but he charged them all to tell that to no man. So that the beginning of the dialogue, the middest, and the ending, appertaining to all, why then shoulde any speciall thing be attributed to any one aboue others by these wordes. Besides that which is spoken here alone to Peter in the singular number in the 18. Chapter, is spoken to all in the plurall number. Verily I saie vnto you, whatsoeuer ye binde in earth, shall be bound in Heauen, and whatsoeuer ye

loose in earth, shalbe loosed in Heauen. Here equall authoritie is giuen to all in the same wordes. But let vs obserue further, that Christ saith here, *Dabo*, I will giue thee the keyes of the kingdome of Heauen, and so forth. Here the keyes are promised but not giuen. If then Christ when he persourmed this promise, gaue not any special power to Peter, but endued them all with the like, shall we imagine here any special thing giuen him to be preferred before others, in the 20. of Iohn, *Iohn.20.* where Christ persourmed this after his resurrection, he committed this power and authoritie he promised here vnto al equally in these wordes: Peace be vnto you, as my father sent me, euen so sende I you, & when he had said that, he breathed vpon them, & they receiued ẏ holy Ghost, adding Whose soeuer sinnes ye remit, they are remitted vnto thē, & whose soeuer sinnes ye retain, they are retained. Here we see he giueth his peace vnto them al: he breatheth on them all: they all receiue the holy ghost alike: they are al endewed with ẏ same power of forgiuing & reteining sins. Where is then Peters prerogatiue: especially now when it should specially haue bin specified.

But what if any principall authoritie and power had beene giuen to Peter by Christ here, what doth that belong to the Bishop of Rome: where is Peters will and testament, by which he hath bequeathed his keyes, rather vnto him than vnto the Bishops of Ierusalem or Antioche, by what Scripture can they proue that Christ hath made them rather Peters successours in this authoritie and commission then other Bishops. If the keyes were promised, & giuen to Peter alone, and to none of the other Apostles, howe dare they giue them vnto the Bishops of Rome. There is not one worde in the Scripture of their succession by inheritance. Seeing then that neither the course of the dialogue, nor yet the authoritie and function is other, that is here giuen, then was giuen to all the Apostles of Christ, himselfe afterwarde in like manner, and that although some more speciall and excellent office was cõmitted to Peter, then to any other Apostle, yet that the B. of Rome cannot claim that more than any other Bishop, it maketh nothing for the establishing of ẏ supreme power ouer the vniuersall Church of God which the Pope arrogateth vnto himself.

Mat.

But let vs sée what the auncient & learned fathers thinke on this point. That which Origen writeth is most plaine against them which think any speciall thing was giuen to Peter. *An soli Petro dantur claues regni cœlorum &c.* Doest thou thinke that the keyes of the kingdom were only giuē to Peter and to no other, neither any other should receiue them? If these words were not common to all men as they are (I will giue thee the keyes of the kingdome of heauen) how can al these sayings & things which are applyed to Peter before be common to all men. For Christ thus spake in common to them all, Whome do ye saye that I am? and Peter answered in the name of all. Doeth he not vtter the same in plainer wordes in the 20. of Iohn saying to all the Apostles, and breathing vpō them: receiue the holie Ghost, whose sinnes ye forgiue, &c. They were all of like authoritie with Peter. Thus much Origen, then which wordes, what can be more plaine. Cyprian also in his booke *de simplicitate Prelatorum* against the Nouatians confirmeth this. The Lord (sayth he) saith vnto Peter, thou art Peter. The Lord after his resurrection gaue vnto his Apo-

Ioan.20.

Cyp. de simp. prælat.

ſtles like power, yet to declare the vnitie, he diſpoſed the originall of vnitie beginneth at one. The reſt of the Apoſtles were euen the ſame that Peter was, endewed with like fellowſhip both of honour and power, but the beginning proceedeth of vnitie to declare one Church. Baſil alſo ſayeth: *Chriſtus Petrum poſt ſe ſuæ Eccleſiæ paſtorem conſtituit &c.* Chriſt appointed Peter to be Paſtor of his Church after, and ſo conſequently giueth the ſame power and authoritie to all Paſtours and doctours, a token whereof is this that all Paſtours, doe equally binde and loſe as they liſt, as well as he. Auguſtine, *de Agone Chriſtiano Cap. 32. Cum Petro dicitur paſce oues meas, omnibus dicitur.* When it is ſayde to Peter fæde my ſhæpe, it is ſaide to all. And in the 31. Chapter: Wretched men while in Peter they vnderſtande not Chriſt which is the rocke, and while they wil not beléue that the keyes of the kingdome of Heauen, are giuen vnto the Church (not vnto Peter alone) they haue loſt the keyes out of their handes, and in another place hee ſayeth, the Churche which is founded in Chriſt, hath taken the keyes of him. ſo that not Peter onely,

Baſil. 23. cap. de vita ſolit.

Auſt. de Agon. Chriſt. cap. 31. & cap. 32.

Aug. tract. 124. ſuper

but the whole Church receiued the keyes of him. Beda sayeth, the power of bynding and loosing, although it seeme to be giuen onely vnto Peter, without doubt this is to bee knowen, that it is giuen also vnto the other Apostles. Haymo, one of their owne doctors well weighing the text affirmeth contrarie vnto them. Wee must not thinke, sayeth hee, that vnto blessed Peter alone this power was giuen, but as hee for all answered, Thou art Christ the sonne of the liuing God, so in the person of one, all heard, whatsoeuer thou shalt binde in earth, &c. Cyrill, Christ gaue full power vnto the Apostles and vnto others that succeeded them in the Churches. To conclude then, if by the testimonyes of the auncient and learned fathers, Christ gaue full and like power to all his Apostles. If the rest of the Apostles were the same that Peter was, endewed all with like honour and power. If Christes wordes were common to all the rest. If all Pastours doe equally binde and loose as well as Peter, then is there no speciall priuilege giuen vnto Peter aboue others by this place. Wherefore I trust this first poynt is ma-

Beda.

Cyr. in Ioan. li. 3. cap. 20.

nifest by the circumstance of the place and opinion of ancient writers that there is no speciall prerogatiue or function giuen vnto Peter, that was not committed to all, & that whatsoeuer was spoken by Christ here vnto Peter did not belong here vnto him only, but to them al in common. Now secondly haue wee to consider what was that power & authoritie that was giuē vnto Peter here, that was to haue the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, the authoritie of binding & loosing, but herein haue wee to weigh what is meant & contained in these words & how farre they ought to stretch. For the B. of Rome claimeth by right of succession & inheritance whatsoeuer power & iurisdiction was giuen vnto Peter, & therfore by the vertue of these wordes, & promise of Christ, claimeth al power & authoritie, whatsoeuer may be contained & included in these speaches. Hereof hath he challenged to himselfe to be aboue kings & Princes, to haue ẏ authoritie of consecrating & deposing them, to be aboue all general councels to haue fulnes of power to expound the scriptures, to whose determination the Church of God must necessarily stand: to haue authoritie to dispense with

Gods worde, to make that lawfull which before was vnlawfull, to haue absolute, & free power to decree whatsoeuer he liketh of, and that of the church is to be obserued as an heauenly Oracle, that he hath power to giue heauen, to throwe downe into hell whome he will, that he hath power to assoyle mens sinnes, and to deliuer them both *a pena & culpa*, both from the fault & penaltie, and to reteine and keepe them at his pleasure, that he may binde and loose aboue all other Bishops; for he may loose whome other Bishops binde: he may bind whome other Bishops loose: but whome he bindeth or looseth can no man assoyle or binde, but onely he himselfe: for Bulles, pardons, indulgencies, anathematizations and all the rest of such trishtrash, hath been founded vpon this power and prerogatiue he challengeth vnto him selfe by this place, the refutation of which particuler pointes being to ample a matter to be handled at this time, and besides hauing sufficiently both in this seconde part, and also in the thirde, declared and proued that no prerogatiue is giuen vnto Peter aboue others by this place, that his ministerie was endewed with no greater power and autho-

thoritie then the ministerie of the rest of the Apostles, it shalbee needelesse to deale with them at this present, onely that is needefull to shewe what is meant by the keyes of the kingdome of heauen, and the authoritie of bynding and loosing. By the keyes is meant nothing else here but the preaching of the Gospell, and herein wee agree with Chrysostome, that sayeth, they are the knowledge of the Scriptures, with Tertullian which tearmeth them to bee the interpretation of the lawe, and with Eusebius, that they are the worde of GOD. and verie well may the preaching of the worde bee expressed by the Metaphore of a keye. For as by it wee are let into the house, so by the preaching of the worde, are wee brought into the Church and housholde of GOD, and haue accesse to his kingdome. For Christ being the dore, as Saint Iohn testifieth, by whome wee must enter, if wee will be saued, and the ladder, by which wee must ascende vp into heauen, as appeareth by Iacobs dreame, and the preaching of the Gospell, opening and manifesting vnto vs Christ, as Paul witnesseth, that vnto him the least of al Saints was giuen

Chrysostom.
Tertullian.
Eusebius.

this grace, that hee shoulde preach among the Gentiles, the vnsearchable riches of Christ, and being the meanes, whereby wee are reconciled vnto Christ, Paul tearming his ministerie therefore the ministerie of reconciliation, the publishing and preachinge of Christ and his Gospell, may well therefore be tearmed a keye. This Metaphore is vsed of our Sauiour Christ in the same sense. Woe be to you interpreters of the lawe, for you haue taken away the keye of knowledge. Ye entred not in your selues, and them that came yee forbad, in which wordes our Sauiour Christ termeth the true interpretation of the lawe and preaching of the Gospel, the key of knowledge. For it was that the Scribes & Pharises did suppresse & adulterate. It is apparant enough, that the worde of God, according to the sundry effectes and properties therof hath sundrie names. So for that it encreaseth and multiplyeth, it is called seede, for that it cutteth the heart, and deuydeth the flesh from the Spirite, it is called a Sworde. For that it taketh vs, and encloseth vs, and bringeth vs togither, it is called a nett. For that it washeth

Luc. 12. 52.

vs cleane it is called water. For that it enflameth vs, it is called fire. For that it feedeth vs it is called bread: euen so for that it openeth & giueth vs an entrance into the house, it is called a keye. This house is the kingdome of heauen: Christ is the dore: the worde of God is the keye, and Preachers the keye bearers. So sayeth Chrysostom: The keye bearers be the Priestes, to whome is committed the teaching of the worde, and of the expounding of the Scriptures: So then, that by the Metaphore of the keye, the Euangelist should declare that Christ committed vnto his Apostles, the preaching of his worde, by which his Church should be gathered togither, and built vppon Christ the rocke, is no strange speach, but verie fit and significant, to declare that vnto vs, and hereby also he sheweth that he hath committed vnto them a great office and weightie function, and that he putteth them in chiefe place and authoritie. For he hath the chiefest authoritie in ỳ house or citie to whome the keyes are committed, and who hath authoritie to let out and let in by them. To this end God vseth this Metaphore in the Prophet Esay, when he promiseth to

Chrys. opere imperfect. cap. 23.

Esa. 22. 22.

Eliachim the chéefe power and authoritie in the King Ezechias house, saying: with my garments I will cloath him, with my girdle I will strengthen him, and the keye of the house of Dauid will I lay vppon his shoulder, so he shall open, and no man shall shut. Hereby haue we to learne, that as those to whome this charge is committed to beare the keyes of the Kingdome of heauen, ought to haue a great care of the well ordering of them, so we must also with no lesse carefulnesse and reuerence, embrace and receyue them. The vse of these keyes is in more perticular manner declared by our Sauiour Christ, when as he saith that whatsoeuer he bindeth on earth shall be bound in heauen, &c. by ỳ power of binding and losing is meant that which is expressed by Saint John. Whose sinnes yee forgiue, they are forgiuen him, and whose sinnes ye retayne, they are retayned, for when our sinnes are forgiuen, we are loseb from them, & when they are not forgiuen, we remayne bound in them, these things are brought to passe in vs by the ministerie of his word, and by the vertue and power thereof. So sayth Ierome, whatsoeuer yee lose in earth, shall be loseb in Heauen, the

Ioan. 20.

Hieron. Esai. lib. 6.

Apostles lose them by the worde of God, and testimonies of the scriptures, and exhortations vnto vertue. And Ambrose, Sinnes be forgiuen by the worde of God, the expounder thereof is the Leuite and Priest. The Prophet Esai prophecying the sending of Christ, sayth that the Lorde had annointed him that he shoulde preache the Gospell to the poore, that he shoulde heale the broken hearted and preach deliuerance to the Captiue, recouering of sighte to the blind, and setting at libertie them that are lowsed: so that to binde and lose, to forgiue and retaine sinnes, is a propertie and effect of the worde of God preached. For that publisheth vnto vs remission of sinnes, worketh in vs mortification, deliuereth vs from the power of Sathan, and restoreth vnto vs the libertie and frédome of the children of God, which thinges bée brought to passe, not by the bare publishing and hearing of the worde, but when as by faith we lay hold vpon the swéete promises, and greate benefites whiche bée offered vs in Christ, which be deliuered vnto vs by his ministers, as by his Legates, for remission of sinnes is in the Priest, as in the messenger, in the worde of God as in the instru-

Ambr. de Cain & Abel. cap. 4.

ment, and in the penitent, as in the receyuer. So that the offering hereof is in the minister, but the effect and force thereof in the sinner. But for as muche as they offer the merites of Christ, and full pardon to such as haue lowly and contrite harts, and doe vnfainedly repent themselues, pronoũcing vnto the same a sure and vndoubted forgiuenesse of their sinnes, and hope of euerlasting life, therefore they are sayde to binde and lose, to reteine and forgiue sins, not because God hath endued his ministers with this absolute power to forgiue and reteine them at their pleasure, as our popishe Priests woulde beare vs in hand, for that hee hath reserued vnto him alone, and it only belongeth vnto him. Euen the verye malicious Scribes and Phariseis knew this, for when as Christe had sayde vnto the man sick of the Palsey, sonne thy sinnes are forgiuen, they not acknowledging him to be God, sayd among thẽselues, this man blasphemeth, who can forgiue sinnes but God only. And God by the Prophet Esai challengeth this vnto himselfe, I euen I am he that putteth away thine iniquitie, euen as to create, to alter & change the heart, to destroy body and soule belon-

Mare. 2. 5.

Esai.

geth only vnto God, and so also to forgiue and reteine sinnes. The antient Fathers haue iudged that the Priest ought to haue no right to challenge any authoritie to forgiue sinnes. Ambrose sayth, it is not the Embassadour, it is not the Messenger, but the Lord himselfe hath saued his people. He remaineth one, for this cannot bee common to any man with Christe to forgiue sinnes, that is only the office of Christ who hath borne the sinnes of the worlde. And Austine, God gaue the ministerie of forgiuing of sinnes to his seruauntes, but the power thereof he retained to himselfe. So in another place, the office of baptizing God hath graunted vnto many: the power and authoritie of forgiuing sinnes, he hath reserued to himselfe alone. Saint Ierome expounding this place very well declareth what power and commission is giuen to Gods ministers in this behalfe. We reade in scriptures that the Leapers are bidden to shew themselues vnto the Priest, that if they be Leapers, they should be so made of the Priest, not that the Priest doe make the leaprous or vncleane, but that they haue knowledge of the leaprous and clean person, that they are able to iudge who is

Ambr. li. 9. Epist. 76.

August.

August. de scalis Paradisi.

Hierony.

cleane or vncleane, euen therefore as the Priest maketh the cleane or vncleane, so doth the Bishop here bind and lose, hereby we see that Ierome thought Ministers had no further power, then to declare them to be lose or bound, euen as the Priests in the time of the law, had no power but to iudge and pronounce the man eyther cleane or vnclean, but not to clense them, or to make them vncleane. So sayth Bonauentura, they did clense because they shewed the cleane. Peter Lumbard, one of their owne Doctors, sayth, hauing well weighed this matter. Christ gaue to priests authority to binde or lose, that is to declare to men they bee bounde or lose: What therefore the authoritie of binding and losing, the forgiuing and reteining of sinnes is, that is giuen to the ministers of God, it is apparant not to haue giuen ful power to absolue and binde of themselues at their will, but to publish that pardon that God in Christ offereth vs, which if we take hold on by faith then we are assoiled, if we contemne it our sinnes are reteined to oure condemnation, and because he hath committed the publishing of forgiuenesse of sinnes vnto his ministers, therefore his ministers are said

Bonauentura.

Pet. Lumb.

to forgiue and reteine, not because the power thereof resteth in themselues, as our popish priests would chalenge: For therefore haue they made the Priest to holde a consistory, and to be a iudge ouer the sinnes of the people, and to driue them to make particular confession of their secrete sinnes vnto the Priest, that they may absolue thē, and enioyne them a penaunce answerable to their offence. Howsoeuer they go about to cloke and colour the matter, in very deed they take vpon them that which is proper to God to iudge of the weight & greuousnesse of sinnes to appoint and alot to euery one a iust satisfaction, to chaunge eternall paynes into temporall, to haue the disposing of the merites of Christ, euen as the Executors haue the disposing of dead mens goods, as though Christ were not, or knew not after his death, how to bestow them, to geue Heauen and throwe downe to Hell, whome they will, to rehearse the particular blasphemies and impieties, whiche by the keyes of heauen, and authoritie of binding and losing they claime, they haue run into, although it were profitable, to consider the abhominations of that Church, yet least I should grow infinite, it shalbe suffi-

ciente to haue but lightlye touched these thinges. Thus I trust I haue sufficientlye declared, first that God reuealeth the knowledge of all heauenly thinges, Secondlye that not Peter, but Christe is the Rocke whereon God doth build his Church, and last of all that the keyes of the kingdome of heauen, and the authoritie of binding and losing consisteth in the preaching of his word. God of his mercye graunt vnto vs, the reuealing of his Christ, and to be builte vpon him the true rocke, and the opening of the kingdome of heauē, by the preaching of his worde, that wee maye obtayne that blessednesse, which Christe hath prepared for them that truly acknowledge and confesse him, To whome with the Father and the holy Ghost be al honour and glory, and power, now and for euermore, *Amen.*